

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 31, 2006 has been fully considered by the Applicant. The telephone conference interview with Examiner Kyle Stork on January 17, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

By way of the present amendment, independent Claims 16 and 17 have each been amended to clearly convey that the processing of received data is accomplished by a browser in the present invention and that the browser is prevented from reformatting of the web page display while the browser receives the data. The reformatting of the web page display is only undertaken if a predetermined time has elapsed or if a predetermined event has occurred.

The rejection of the claims, as now amended, under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,239) in view of Lowery et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,554) is respectfully traversed. Unlike the prior art, the present invention prevents reformatting of a web page by a browser as the browser downloads the page. Paragraph 8 on pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action states that "the Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach displaying to the web page by a web browser as the data is received by the web browser" with Allen cited as prior art. However, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Allen does not disclose controlling to occur after a predetermined time. In the Office Action on page 3, the Examiner cites to Lowery as prior art, citing to column 10, lines 30-51. In the present invention, reformatting of the web page is performed by a browser rather than a server as disclosed and taught in Lowery (as the browser downloads the page, and while the browser downloads the page, this reformatting by the browser is prevented until a predetermined time or event).

In the present invention, reformatting of the web page is performed by the browser (rather than a server as in Lowery) as the browser downloads the page, and while the browser downloads the page this reformatting by the browser is prevented by a predetermined time or event.

The Examiner states at point 4 of the report that “Allen does not specifically disclose [that as] the data is being received the reformatting of the displayed web page is controlled so as to occur only after a predetermined time has elapsed since the previous web page reformat or after a predetermined event has occurred to reduce the number of reformats required in displaying the web page as data is received”. However, the Examiner states that this feature is disclosed in Lowery.

Lowery discloses balancing the load on a web server when dynamically creating the web pages on that server, and there is no teaching in this document of preventing the reformatting of a web page by a browser as the browser receives the page on a client machine, only the cacheing of data structures already dynamically created on a server.

If the teaching of Lowery were applied to Allen, in processing block 504 of Lowery, the interceptor would receive several URL requests (Allen teaches pre-cacheing of web pages by the client, so the client would send several URL requests relating to links on the current page), in processing block 508 the dispatcher determines which page servers are available, in processing block 514 the page server produces the HTML documents, then in processing block 524 the server sends the prepared pages to the browser. Therefore, the combination of Lowery and Allen teach that the server is responsible for preparing the page, and the browser receives the page and continuously reformats the page as the page is received, which can be annoying to a user as the display jerks or flickers, particularly when the processing power is limited. The

invention solves this problem by subjectively preventing this continuous reformatting while the page is being received.

The combined teachings of Lowery and Allen are thus distinct from the present invention as there is no teaching of preventing reformatting of the page by the browser as the page is being received by the browser. As such, the independent claims are novel and inventive over the prior art cited.

In conclusion, Lowery adds no further teaching to Allen that would teach the prevention of reformatting of the web page displays in a browser to reduce the number of reformats required in displaying that web page as data is received.

The remaining claims are dependent on Claims 16 and 17 and are believed allowable for the same reasons.

In summary, it is believed that the claims, as now amended, define the invention over the prior art.

It is believed that the foregoing is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If any issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Mark G. Kachigian, Reg. No. 32,840
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN
228 West 17th Place
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119
(918) 587-2000
Customer No. 24,118
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: January 30, 2007